

FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY

OCT 1 6,2018

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

Deputy

Michael Freund SBN 99687 Ryan Hoffman SBN 283297 Michael Freund & Associates 1919 Addison Street, Suite 105 Berkeley, CA 94704 Telephone: (510) 540-1992 Facsimile: (510) 540-5543

5

2

3

4

Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.

7 Amy P. Lally SBN 198555

Sidley Austin LLP

1999 Avenue of the Stars, 17th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: (310) 595 9662

Email: alally@sidley.com

10

11

8

9

Attorney for Defendants

Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing business as

12 Smart for Life; and Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing

business as Smart for Life

13 14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC., a California non-profit corporation

Plaintiff,

vs.

DOCTORS SCIENTIFIC ORGANICA, LLC, individually and doing business as SMART FOR LIFE; LAVI ENTERPRISES, LLC, individually and doing business as SMART FOR LIFE; and DOES 1-100

Defendants.

CASE NO. RG18915427

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.

Action Filed:

Trial Date: None set

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On Aug. 3, 2018, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), a

non-profit corporation, as a private enforcer and in the public interest, initiated this action by

Page 1 of 20

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	filing a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief and Civil Penalties (the "Complaint"			
2	pursuant to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq.			
3	("Proposition 65"), against Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing business a			
4	Smart for Life; and Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life			
5	(collectively "Smart for Life") and Does 1-100. In this action, ERC alleges that a number of			
6	products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Smart for Life contain lead, cadmium and/or			
7	acrylamide, chemicals listed under Proposition 65 as carcinogens and reproductive toxins, and			
8	expose consumers to these chemicals at a level requiring a Proposition 65 warning. These			
9	products (referred to hereinafter individually as a "Covered Product" or collectively as "Covered			
10	Products") are: (1) SmartforLife Vanilla Protein Shake (lead), (2) SmartforLife Chocolate			
11	Protein Shake (lead, cadmium), (3) SmartforLife Vanilla Greens Protein Shake (lead), (4)			
12	SmartforLife Protein Bar S'MORES (lead, cadmium), (5) SmartforLife Protein Bar Chocolate			
13	(lead, cadmium), (6) SmartforLife Protein Bar Peanut Butter Chocolate (lead, cadmium), (7)			
14	SmartforLife Protein Bar Caramel Almond (lead), (8) SmartforLife Banana Chocolate Chip			
15	Square (lead), (9) SmartforLife Protein Bar Strawberry Yogurt (lead), (10) SmartforLife Protein			
16.	Bar Luscious Lemon (lead), (11) SmartforLife Protein Bar Blueberry (lead), (12) SmartforLife			
17	Protein Bar Cinnamon Pecan (lead), (13) SmartforLife Protein Bar Choco Crisp (lead,			
18	cadmium), (14) SmartforLife Protein Bar Strawberry & Cream (lead), (15) SmartforLife Protein			
19	Bar Peanut Butter Choco (lead), (16) SmartforLife Chocolate Chip Cookies (lead), (17)			
20	SmartforLife Blueberry Cookies (lead), (18) SmartforLife Oatmeal Raisin Cookie (lead), (19)			
21	SmartforLife Irresistible Winner Peanut Butter Cookie (lead), (20) SmartforLife Irresistible			
22	Winner Chocolate Chip Cookie (lead, cadmium), (21) SmartforLife 1.877.601.SASS Cranberry			
23	Granola Square (lead), (22) SmartforLife Chocolate Protein Shake, (23) SmartforLife Vanilla			
24	Protein Shake, (24) SmartforLife Protein Bar S'MORES, (24) SmartforLife Protein Bar Choco			
25	Crisp, (25) SmartforLife Oatmeal Raisin Cookie, (26) SmartforLife Banana Chocolate Chip			
26	Square, and (27) SmartforLife Chocolate Chip Cookies.			
27	1.2 ERC and Smart for Life are hereinafter referred to individually as a "Party" or			

collectively as the "Parties."

28

- 1.3 ERC is a 501 (c)(3) California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.
- 1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties agree that each defendant is a business entity each of which has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action, and qualifies as a "person in the course of business" within the meaning of Proposition 65. Smart for Life manufactures, distributes, and/or sells the Covered Products.
- 1.5 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notices of Violation dated February 12, 2018 and May 24, 2018 that were served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Smart for Life ("Notices"). True and correct copies of the 60-Day Notices dated February 12, 2018 and May 24, 2018 are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B and each is incorporated herein by reference. More than 60 days have passed since the Notices were served on the Attorney General, public enforcers, and Smart for Life and no designated governmental entity has filed a complaint against Smart for Life with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.
- 1.6 ERC's Notices and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Products exposes persons in California to lead, cadmium and/or acrylamide without first providing clear and reasonable warnings in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Smart for Life denies all material allegations contained in the Notices and Complaint.
- 1.7 The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise, and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation.

 Nothing in this Consent Judgment nor compliance with this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by any of the Parties or by any of their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law.

1.8 Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any current or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.

1.9 The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which notice is given that it has been entered as a Judgment by this Court.

2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

For purposes of this Consent Judgment and any further court action that may become necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint, personal jurisdiction over Smart for Life as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in Alameda County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims up through and including the Effective Date which were or could have been asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notices and Complaint.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION, TESTING AND WARNINGS

- 3.1 Beginning on the Effective Date, Smart for Life shall be permanently enjoined from manufacturing for sale in the State of California, "Distributing into the State of California," or directly selling in the State of California, any Covered Products which expose a person to a "Daily Lead Exposure Level" of more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day and/or "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level" of more than 4.1 micrograms of cadmium per day and/or a "Daily Acrylamide Exposure Level" of more than 0.2 micrograms of acrylamide per day unless it meets the warning requirements under Section 3.2.
- 3.1.1 As used in this Consent Judgment, the term "Distributing into the State of California" shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that Smart for Life knows or has reason to know will sell the Covered Product in California.
- 3.1.2 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of lead per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the

27

28

///

product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings of the product per day (using the largest number of recommended daily servings appearing on the label), excluding the amounts of allowances for "Naturally Occurring Lead" (defined below) in the ingredients listed in **Table 1**, which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day. If the label contains no recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.

3.1.3 In calculating the Daily Lead Exposure Level for a Covered Product, Smart for Life shall be allowed to deduct the amount of lead which is deemed to be Naturally Occurring Lead in any ingredient listed in Table 1 ("Lead Ingredient") that is contained in that Covered Product under the following conditions: (a) Smart for Life itself or from its Lead Ingredient supplier shall obtain either (i) a valid test result showing lead is present in the Lead Ingredient at a specific concentration or in a range; or (ii) a certificate of analysis or certificate of compliance that shows lead is present in the Lead Ingredient at a specific concentration or in a range; and (b) Smart for Life shall obtain the documentation in Section 3.1.3(a) (i) or (ii) for at least two delivered lots of a Lead Ingredient listed in Table 1, if up to four (4) lots of that Lead Ingredient are delivered within twelve (12) months of the Effective Date, and documentation for at least three (3) lots of a Lead Ingredient if up to eight (8) lots of that Lead Ingredient are delivered within twelve (12) months of the Effective Date, and documentation for at least four (4) lots of a Lead Ingredient if nine (9) or more lots of that Lead Ingredient are delivered within twelve (12) months of the Effective Date; and (c) Smart for Life shall document the total amount (in grams) of each Lead Ingredient contained in the Covered Product. If the documentation obtained pursuant to Section 3.1.3(a) and (b) documents the presence of lead in any Lead Ingredient in Table 1, Smart for Life shall be entitled to deduct the amount of the Naturally Occurring Lead for that Lead Ingredient, as listed in Table 1. If the Covered Product does not contain a Lead Ingredient listed in Table 1, Smart for Life shall not be entitled to a deduction for the Naturally Occurring Lead in Table 1 for that Covered Product.

To deduct the Naturally Occurring Lead in any Covered Product for purposes of determining the Daily Lead Exposure Level under this Consent Judgment, as provided in this Section 3.1.3, Smart for Life shall provide to ERC, upon request within thirty (30) days after the first anniversary of the Effective Date, the documentation required under Section 3.1.3(a)-(c). Thereafter, for three (3) additional consecutive anniversaries after the Effective Date, if Smart for Life deducts Naturally Occurring Lead in a Lead Ingredient in calculating the Daily Lead Exposure Level, Smart for Life shall provide to ERC, upon request within thirty (30) days after each such anniversary date, the documentation for each Lead Ingredient required under Section 3.1.3(a)-(c) for each such applicable twelve (12) month period.

TABLE 1

INGREDIENT	NATURALLY OCCURRING AMOUNTS OF LEAD
Calcium (elemental)	0.8 micograms/gram
Ferrous Fumarate	0.4 micograms/gram
Zinc Oxide	8.0 micograms/gram
Magnesium Oxide	0.4 micograms/gram
Magnesium Carbonate	0.332 micograms/gram
Magnesium Hydroxide	0.4 micograms/gram
Zinc Gluconate	0.8 micograms/gram
Potassium Chloride	1.1 micograms/gram
Cocoa-powder	1.0 micograms/gram

3.1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of cadmium per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings of the product per day (using the largest number of recommended daily servings appearing on the label), which equals micrograms of cadmium exposure per day. If the label contains no recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.

3.1.5 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Acrylamide Exposure Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of acrylamide per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings of the product per day (using the largest number of recommended daily servings appearing on the label), which equals micrograms of acrylamide exposure per day. If the label contains no recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one:

3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

If Smart for Life is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, the following warning must be utilized ("Warning"):

WARNING: Consuming this product can expose you to chemicals including [lead] [and] [cadmium] [and] [acrylamide] which is [are] known to the State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food.

Smart for Life shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the Warning if Smart for Life has reason to believe that the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is greater than 15 micrograms of lead as determined pursuant to the quality control methodology set forth in Section 3.4, or if the "Daily Acrylamide Exposure Level" is greater than 0.2 micrograms per day, or if Smart for Life has reason to believe that another Proposition 65 chemical is present which may require a cancer warning. As identified in the brackets, the warning shall appropriately reflect whether there is lead, cadmium, acrylamide or all of these chemicals present in each of the Covered Products.

The Warning shall be securely affixed to or printed upon the container or label of each Covered Product. If the Warning is provided on the label, it must be set off from other surrounding information and enclosed in a box. In addition, for any Covered Product sold over the internet by Smart for Life, the Warning shall appear on the checkout page when a California delivery address is indicated for any purchase of any Covered Product or on the product display page for the Covered Product. An asterisk or other identifying method must be utilized to identify which products on the checkout page or product display page are subject to the Warning.

The Warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings also appearing on the respective website page or on the label or container of Smart for Life's product packaging and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. Statements supplemental to the Warning shall comply with Tit. 27, Cal. Code Regs. § 25601(e), as it may be amended from time to time. Presently, statements supplemental to the Warning are allowed only to the extent they identify the source of the exposure or provide information on how consumers of the Covered Products may avoid or reduce exposure to the identified chemical or chemicals.

Smart for Life must display the above Warning with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements or designs on the label or container, or on its website, if applicable, to render the Warning likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use of the product.

3.3 Reformulated Covered Products

A Reformulated Covered Product is a Covered Product for which the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is no greater than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day and/or "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level" is no more than 4.1 micrograms of cadmium per day and/or "Daily Acrylamide Exposure Level" is no more than 0.2 micrograms of acrylamide per day as determined by the quality control methodology described in Section 3.4.

3.4 Testing and Quality Control Methodology

3.4.1 Beginning within one year of the Effective Date, Smart for Life shall arrange for lead and/or cadmium testing of the Covered Products at least once a year for a minimum of five consecutive years by arranging for testing of five randomly selected samples of each of the Covered Products, in the form intended for sale to the end-user, which Smart for Life intends to sell or is manufacturing for sale in California, directly selling to a consumer in California or "Distributing into the State of California." If tests conducted pursuant to this Section demonstrate that no Warning is required for a Covered Product during each of five consecutive years, then the testing requirements of this Section will no longer be required as to that Covered Product. However, if during or after the five-year testing period, Smart for Life

changes ingredient suppliers for any of the Covered Products and/or reformulates any of the Covered Products, Smart for Life shall test that Covered Product annually for at least four (4)

- 3.4.2 For purposes of measuring the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" ant/or "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level" and/or "Daily Acrylamide Exposure Level," the highest lead and/or cadmium detection result of the five (5) randomly selected samples of the Covered
- 3.4.3 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed using a laboratory method that complies with the performance and quality control factors appropriate for the method used, including limit of detection, qualification, accuracy, and precision that meets the following criteria: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry ("ICP-MS") achieving a limit of quantification of less than or equal to 0.010 mg/kg.
- 3.4.4 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by an independent third party laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program or an independent third-party laboratory that is registered with the
- 3.4.5 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit Smart for Life's ability to conduct, or require that others conduct, additional testing of the Covered Products, including
- 3.4.6 Within thirty (30) days of ERC's written request, which shall not be made more than once per year within the first five years after the Effective Date, Smart for Life shall deliver lab reports obtained pursuant to Section 3.4 to ERC. Smart for Life shall retain all test results and documentation for a period of five years from the date of each test.

In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, additional settlement payments, attorney's fees, and costs, Smart for Life shall make a total payment of \$90,000.00 ("Total Settlement Amount") in four monthly payments according to the following payment schedule

~ 1

- Payment 1 -- \$35,000.00 within 5 days of the Effective Date
- Payment 2 -- \$18,333.33 within 35 days of the Effective Date
- Payment 3 -- \$18,333.33 within 65 days of the Effective Date
- Payment 4 -- \$18,333.34 within 95 days of the Effective Date

Smart for Life shall make these payments by wire transfer to ERC's account, for which ERC will give Smart for Life the necessary account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as follows:

- 4.2 \$19,673.44 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$14,755.08) of the civil penalty to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") for deposit in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund in accordance with California Health and Safety Code section 25249.12(c). ERC will retain the remaining 25% (\$4,918.36) of the civil penalty.
- **4.3** \$6,144.76 shall be distributed to ERC as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action.
- 4.4 \$14,755.08 shall be distributed to ERC as an Additional Settlement Payment ("ASP"), pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 11, sections 3203, subdivision (d) and 3204. ERC will utilize the ASP for activities that address the same public harm as allegedly caused by Defendant in this matter. ERC represents that these activities are detailed below and support ERC's overarching goal of reducing and/or eliminating hazardous and toxic chemicals in dietary supplement products in California. ERC represents that its activities have had, and will continue to have, a direct and primary effect within the State of California because California consumers will be benefitted by the reduction and/or elimination of exposure to lead, cadmium and/or acrylamide in dietary supplements and/or by providing clear and reasonable warnings to California consumers prior to ingestion of the products.

Based on a review of past years' actual budgets, ERC represents that it is providing the following list of activities ERC engages in to protect California consumers through Proposition 65 citizen enforcement, along with a breakdown of how ASP funds will be utilized to facilitate those activities: (1) ENFORCEMENT (65-80%): obtaining, shipping, analyzing, and testing

28

dietary supplement products that may contain lead, cadmium and/or acrylamide and are sold to California consumers. This work includes continued monitoring and enforcement of past consent judgments and settlements to ensure companies are in compliance with their obligations thereunder, with a specific focus on those judgments and settlements concerning lead, cadmium and/or acrylamide. This work also includes investigation of new companies that ERC does not obtain any recovery through settlement or judgment; (2) VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE PROGRAM (10-20%): maintaining ERC's Voluntary Compliance Program by acquiring products from companies, developing and maintaining a case file, testing products from these companies, providing the test results and supporting documentation to the companies, and offering guidance in warning or implementing a self-testing program for lead, cadmium and/or acrylamide in dietary supplement products; and (3) "GOT LEAD" PROGRAM (up to 5%): maintaining ERC's "Got Lead?" Program which reduces the numbers of contaminated products that reach California consumers by providing access to free testing for lead in dietary supplement products (Products submitted to the program are screened for ingredients which are suspected to be contaminated, and then may be purchased by ERC, catalogued, sent to a qualified laboratory for testing, and the results shared with the consumer that submitted the product).

ERC shall be fully accountable in that it will maintain adequate records to document and will be able to demonstrate how the ASP funds will be spent and can assure that the funds are being spent only for the proper, designated purposes described in this Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide the Attorney General, within thirty days of any request, copies of documentation demonstrating how such funds have been spent.

- 4.5 \$2,115.00 shall be distributed to Michael Freund as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees, \$9,165.00 shall be distributed to Ryan Hoffman as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees, while \$38,146.72 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.
- 4.6 In the event that Smart for Life fails to remit a payment pursuant to Section 4.1 on or before the respective Due Date, Smart for Life shall be deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide written notice of the

delinquency to Smart for Life via electronic mail. If Smart for Life fails to deliver the delinquent payment within fifteen (15) days from the written notice, the Total Settlement Amount, less any amounts previously paid pursuant to Section 4.1, shall be immediately due and owing and shall accrue interest at the statutory judgment interest rate provided in the California Code of Civil Procedure section 685.010. Additionally, Smart for Life agrees to pay ERC's reasonable attorney's fees and costs for any efforts to collect the payment due under this Consent Judgment.

5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only as to injunctive terms (i) by written stipulation of the Parties and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment or (ii) by motion of either Party pursuant to Section 5.3 or 5.4 and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment.
- 5.2 If either party seeks to modify this Consent Judgment under Section 5.1, then that party must provide written notice to the other party of its intent ("Notice of Intent"). The parties shall meet and confer regarding the proposed modification in the Notice of Intent Within thirty (30) days of that meeting, if there remains a dispute over the proposed modification, the Party disputing the modification shall provide the other Party a written basis for its position. The Parties shall continue to meet and confer for an additional thirty (30) days in an effort to resolve any remaining disputes. Should it become necessary, the Parties may agree in writing to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.
- 5.3 In the event that a party initiates or otherwise requests a modification under Section 5.1, and the meet and confer process leads to a joint motion or application for a modification of the Consent Judgment, that party shall reimburse the other party its costs and reasonable attorney's fees for the time spent in the meet-and-confer process and filing and arguing the motion or application. No party shall be reimbursed for costs or attorney's fees for an uncontested motion, or for a ministerial motion (such as a change in name or contact information) or if the party does not expend more than two (2) hours of attorney time on the joint motion.

5.4 Where the meet-and-confer process does not lead to a joint motion or application in support of a modification of the Consent Judgment, then either Party may seek judicial relief on its own.

6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 6.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify, or terminate this Consent Judgment.
- 6.2 If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Reformulated Covered Product (for which ERC alleges that no Warning has been provided), then ERC shall inform Smart for Life in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information sufficient to permit Smart for Life to identify the Covered Products at issue. Smart for Life shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice, provide ERC with testing information, from an independent third-party laboratory meeting the requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4, demonstrating Smart for Life's compliance with the Consent Judgment, if warranted. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application to any Covered Product which is distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and which is not used by California consumers.

8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Smart for Life and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of Smart for Life), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and downstream entities in the

distribution chain of any Covered Product, and the predecessors, successors, and assigns of any of them (collectively, "Released Parties"). ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, hereby fully releases and discharges the Released Parties from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs, and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted from the handling, use, or consumption of the Covered Products, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Products regarding lead, cadmium and/or acrylamide up to and including the Effective Date.

- 8.2 ERC on its own behalf only, and Smart for Life on its own behalf only, further waive and release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or statements made or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing enforcement of Proposition 65 in connection with the Notices and Complaint up through and including the Effective Date, provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.
- 8.3 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts alleged in the Notices and Complaint, and relating to the Covered Products, will develop or be discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, and Smart for Life on behalf of itself only, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up through and including the Effective Date, including all rights of action therefore. ERC and Smart for Life acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.1 and 8.2 above may include unknown claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code section 1542 as to any such unknown claims. California Civil Code section 1542 reads as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

ERC on behalf of itself only, and Smart for Life on behalf of itself only, acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code section 1542.

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

FOR DOCTORS SCIENTIFIC ORGANICA, LLC, individually and doing business as SMART FOR LIFE; LAVI ENTERPRISES, LLC, individually 2 and doing business as SMART FOR LIFE: Dr. Sasson Moulavi 3 Smart for Life 1210 West 13th Street Riviera Beach, FL 33404 5 6 With a copy to: Amy P. Lally Sidley Austin LLP 1999 Avenue of the Stars, 17th Floor 8 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: (310) 595 9662 Email: alally@sidley.com 10 12. COURT APPROVAL 11 Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a 12 12.1 Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this 13 Consent Judgment. 14 12.2 If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment, 15 the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible 16 prior to the hearing on the motion. 17 If this Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be 18 void and have no force or effect. 19 20 13. **EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS** 21 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed to be as valid 22 23 as the original signature. 14. DRAFTING 24 25 The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for each Party prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms and 26 conditions with legal counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and 27 construction of this Consent Judgment, no inference, assumption, or presumption shall be drawn, 28 Page 16 of 20 STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1;

and no provision of this Consent Judgment shall be construed against any Party, based on the fact that one of the Parties and/or one of the Parties' legal counsel prepared and/or drafted all or any portion of the Consent Judgment. It is conclusively presumed that all of the Parties participated equally in the preparation and drafting of this Consent Judgment.

15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES

If a dispute arises with respect to either Party's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet and confer in person, by telephone, and/or in writing and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No action or motion may be filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand.

16. ENFORCEMENT

ERC may, by motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Alameda County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any action brought by ERC to enforce this Consent Judgment, ERC may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment. To the extent the failure to comply with the Consent Judgment constitutes a violation of Proposition 65 or other laws, ERC shall not be limited to enforcement of this Consent Judgment, but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws.

17. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION

- 17.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.
- 17.2 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment.

18. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF 1 2 **CONSENT JUDGMENT** 3 This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed 4 5 regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to: 6 (1) Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a fair and 7 equitable settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint that the matter has 8 been diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and 9 (2) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 10 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment. 11 IT IS SO STIPULATED: 12 13 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC 14 15 16 17 Dated: _____, 2018 DOCTORS SCIENTIFIC ORGANICA 18 LLC, individually and doing 19 business as SMART FOR LIFE 20 By: 21 Its: 22 Dated: _____, 2018 LAVI ENTERPRISES, LLC, individually 23 and doing business as SMART FOR LIFE 24 25 By: 26 Its: 27 28 Page 18 of 20 STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF 1 2 **CONSENT JUDGMENT** 3 This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The 4 Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed 5 regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to: Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a fair and 6 (1)7 equitable settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint that the matter has 8 been diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and 9 (2)Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 10 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment. 11 12 IT IS SO STIPULATED: 13 Dated: , 2018 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC. 14 15 By: Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director 16 17 DOCTORS SCIENTIFIC ORGANICA, 18 LLC, individually and doing 19 business as SMART FOR LIFE 20 21 Weners. 22 LAVI ENTERPRISES, LLC, individually 23 and doing business as SMART FOR LIFE 24 25 26 27 28 Page 18 of 20

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	APPROVED AS TO FORM:					
2	Dated: 8/6, 2018 MICHAEL FREUND & ASSOCIATES					
3	By:					
4	Michael Freund					
5	Ryan Hoffman Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental					
6	Research Center, Inc.					
7	Dated: July 23, 2018 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP					
8						
9	By: Cley 1: Lally					
10	Amy P. Lathy Attorney for Defendants Doctors Scientific					
11	Organica, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life; and Lavi					
12	Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life					
13	Outsiless as Strait 10. Date					
14						
15	··					
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21	· :					
22	:					
23						
24						
25						
26	··					
27						
28	Dans 10 = 520					
	Page 19 of 20 STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT					

1	APPROVED A	S TO FORM:				
2	Dated:	, 2018	MICHAEL FREUND & ASSOCIATES			
3			Ву:			
4			Michael Freund Ryan Hoffman			
5			Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.			
7	Dated:	, 2018	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP			
8						
9			By: Amy P. Lally			
11			Attorney for Defendants Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing			
12			business as Smart for Life; and Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing			
13			business as Smart for Life			
14						
15	: :					
16						
17	۵]: •			
18	÷					
19	,		··			
20	. .					
21	i					
22			4, - 1			
23						
24						
25			4 ! 			
26						
27 28						
-0			Page 19 of 20			
	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT					

ORDER AND JUDGMENT

Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing, this Consent Judgment is approved and Judgment is hereby entered according to its terms.

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED

Dated: 10/16 ,2018

1:7

Judge of the Superior Court

Page 20 of 20

EXHIBIT A

1 2

Michael Freund & Associates

1919 Addison Street, Suite 105 Berkeley, CA 94704 Voice: 510.540.1992 • Fax: 510.540.5543

Michael Freund, Esq.

Ryan Hoffman, Esq.

: }

;

February 12, 2018

NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ. (PROPOSITION 65)

Dear Alleged Violators and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65"), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq., with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violators identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violators and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

General Information about Proposition 65. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violators identified below.

Alleged Violators. The names of the companies covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violators") are:

Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life

Consumer Products and Listed Chemicals. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemicals in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. SmartforLife Vanilla Protein Shake Lead
- 2. SmartforLife Chocolate Protein Shake Lead, Cadmium
- 3. SmartforLife Vanilla Greens Protein Shake Lead
- 4. SmartforLife Protein Bar S'MORES Lead, Cadmium
- 5. SmartforLife Protein Bar Chocolate Lead, Cadmium
- 6. SmartforLife Protein Bar Peanut Butter Chocolate Lead, Cadmium
- 7. SmartforLife Protein Bar Caramel Almond Lead

Exhibit A

- 8. SmartforLife Banana Chocolate Chip Square Lead
- 9. SmartforLife Protein Bar Strawberry Yogurt Lead
- 10. SmartforLife Protein Bar Luscious Lemon Lead
- 11. SmartforLife Protein Bar Blueberry Lead
- 12. SmartforLife Protein Bar Cinnamon Pecan Lead
- 13. SmartforLife Protein Bar Choco Crisp Lead, Cadmium
- 14. SmartforLife Protein Bar Strawberry & Cream Lead
- 15. SmartforLife Protein Bar Peanut Butter Choco Lead
- 16. SmartforLife Chocolate Chip Cookies Lead
- 17. SmartforLife Blueberry Cookies Lead
- 18. SmartforLife Oatmeal Raisin Cookie Lead
- 19. SmartforLife Irresistible Winner Peanut Butter Cookie Lead
- 20. SmartforLife Irresistible Winner Chocolate Chip Cookie Lead, Cadmium
- 21. SmartforLife 1.377.601.SASS Cranberry Granola Square -Lead

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

Cadmium was officially listed as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity and male reproductive toxicity on May 1, 1997, while cadmium and cadmium compounds were listed as chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer on October 1, 1987.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to these chemicals has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least February 12, 2015, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until these known toxic chemicals are either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemicals. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons handling and/or using these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to these chemicals.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violators to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead or at rrhoffma@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

Ryan Hoffman

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

©EHHA Summary (to Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life; Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life; Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life; U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life; and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Dcctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life; Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life; Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life; and U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life

I, Ryan Hoffman, declare:

- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the parties identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
 - 2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
- 3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemicals that are the subject of the notice.
- 4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violators will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: February 12, 2018

Ryan Hoffman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On February 12, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY" on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO
Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually
and doing business as Smart for Life
1210 West 13th Street
Riviera Beach, FL 33404

Current President or CEO Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life 1210 West 13th Street Riviera Beach, FL 33404

Current President or CEO Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life 1210 West 13th Street Riviera Beach, FL 33404

Current President or CEO U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life 1210 West 13th Street Riviera Beach, FL 33404

Current President or CEO Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life 4800 North Federal Highway, Suite 300B Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO
Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually
and doing business as Smart for Life
4800 North Federal Highway, Suite 300B
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life 4800 North Federal Highway, Suite 300B Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life 4800 North Federal Highway, Suite 300B Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO
Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually
and doing business as Smart for Life
3196 North Federal Highway
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life 3196 North Federal Highway Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life 3196 North Federal Highway Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life c/o Sasson Moulavi 3196 North Federal Highway Boca Raton, FL 33431

Sasson Moulavi (U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 591 Phillips Drive

591 Phillips Drive Boca Raton, FL 33431

Sasson Moulavi (Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 3196 North Federal Highway Boca Raton, FL 33431 Palm Law Partners, PA (Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 1801 North Military Trail, Suite 120 Boca Raton, FL 33431

Dr. Sasson Moulavi (Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 3196 North Federal Highway Boca Raton, FL 33431

On February 12, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1) were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On February 12, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 1 verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us Allison Haley, District Attorney Napa County 1127 First Street, Suite C Napa, CA 94559 ' CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney San Francisco County 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory alker@sfgov.org

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202 Stockton, CA 95202 DAConsumer Environmental@sicda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney San Luis Obispo County County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street Santa Cruz, CA 95060 Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org

On February 12, 2018 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on February 12, 2018, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Dunwoody

Service List

District Attorney, Alameda County 1225 Fallon Street, Suite 900 Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street, Suite 202 Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive, Suite 245 Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas. CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa County 346 Fifth Street Suite 101 Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Room 171 Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000 Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn County Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street 4th Floor Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County 940 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County P.O. Drawer'D Independence, CA 93526

District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301 District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles County Hall of Justice 211 West Temple St., Ste 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced County 550 W. Main Street Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202 Alturas. CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Nevada County 201 Commercial Street Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange County 401 West Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678 District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney,San Bernardino County 303 West Third Street San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Suite 1300 San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Santa Barbara County 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101

District Attorney, Shasta County 1355 West Street Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra County 100 Courthouse Square, 2nd Floor Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter County 463 2nd Street Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080 District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba County 215 F fth Street, Suite 152 Marysville, CA 95901

Los Ángeles City Attorney's Office City Hall East 200 N Main Street, Suite 800 Los Ángeles, CA 90012

San D ego City Attorney's Office 1200 Erd Avenue, Ste 1620 San Diego, CA 92101

San Figuresco, City Attorney City Hall, Room 234 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL San Figuresco, CA 94102

San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th filoor San Jose, CA 95113

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as "Proposition 65"). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through These implementing regulations are available online at:
http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

. !

All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Gode of Regulation's unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html.

The "Proposition 65 List." Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65.

Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be "clear and reasonable." This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses "no significant risk." This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed overla 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific "No Significant Risk Levels" (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701

et seq. of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the "no observable effect level" divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 et seq. of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a "significant amount" of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A "significant amount" means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the "no significant risk" level for

²See Section 25501(a)(4).

chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the "no observable effect" level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure
 occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily
 intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:
http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

EXHIBIT B

Michael Freund & Associates

1919 Addison Street, Suite 105 Berkeley, CA 94704 Voice: 510.540.1992 • Fax: 510.540.5543

Michael Freund, Esq.

Ryan Hoffman, Esq.

3

May 24, 2018

NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ. (PROPOSITION 65)

Dear Alleged Violators and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65"), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq., with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violators identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violators and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

<u>General Information about Proposition 65</u>. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violators identified below.

Alleged Violators. The names of the companies covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violators") are:

Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life

<u>Consumer Products and Listed Chemical</u>. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemical in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. SmartforLife Chocolate Protein Shake acrylamide
- 2. SmartforLife Vanilla Protein Shake acrylamide
- 3. SmartforLife Protein Bar S'MORES acrylamide
- 4. SmartforLife Protein Bar Choco Crisp acrylamide
- 5. SmartforLife Oatmeal Raisin Cookie acrylamide
- 6. SmartforLife Banana Chocolate Chip Square acrylamide
- 7. SmartforLife Chocolate Chip Cookies acrylamide

On January 1, 1990, the State of California officially listed acrylamide as a chemical known to cause cancer. On February 25, 2011, the State of California officially listed acrylamide as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity and male reproductive toxicity.

Exhibit B

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to this chemical has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least May 24, 2015, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known taxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violators to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead or at rrhoffma@gmail.com.

Sincerely

Ryan Hoffman

Attachments

Certificate of Merit Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life; Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life; Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life; U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life; and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

'Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life; Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life; Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life; and U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life

I, Ryan Hoffman, declare:

¥.

- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the parties identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
 - 2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
- 3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice.
- 4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violators will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Si E

k g

Dated: May 24, 2018

Ryan Hoffman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On May 24, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY" on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO
Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually
and doing business as Smart for Life
1210 West 13th Street
Riviera Beach, FL 33404

Current President or CEO
Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life
1210 West 13th Street
Riviera Beach, FL 33404

Current President or CEO Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life 1210 West 13th Street Riviera Beach, FL 33404

Current President or CEO
U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually
and doing business as Smart for Life
c/o Sasson Moulavi
1210 West 13th Street
Riviera Beach, FL 33404

Current President or CEO Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life 4800 North Federal Highway, Suite 300B Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO
Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually
and doing business as Smart for Life
4800 North Federal Highway, Suite 300B
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO
Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually
and doing business as Smart for Life
4800 North Federal Highway, Suite 300B
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO
U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life c/o Sasson Moulavi
4800 North Federal Highway, Suite 300B
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO
Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually
and doing business as Smart for Life
3196 North Federal Highway
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO
Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life 3196 North Federal Highway
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO
Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually
and doing business as Smart for Life
3196 North Federal Highway
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Current President or CEO
U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.Q., individually and doing business as Smart for Life c/o Sasson Moulavi
3196 North Federal Highway
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Sasson Moulavi (U.S. Medical Care Holdings, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 591 Phillips Drive Boca Raton, FL 33431

Sasson Moulavi (Lavi Enterprises, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 1210 West 13th Street Riviera Beach, FL 33404 Palm Law Partners, PA
(Doctors Scientific Organica, LLC, individually and doing business as Smart for Life's Registered Agent for Service of Process)
1801 North Military Trail, Suite 120
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Dr. Sasson Moulavi (Lawee Enterprises, L.L.C., individually and doing business as Smart for Life's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 1210 West 13th Street Riviera Beach, FL 33404

On May 24. 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1) were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On May 24, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS**, **CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5** *ET SEQ*; **CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney Napa County 1127 First Street, Suite C Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org

Kathryn L. Turner, Chief Deputy City Attorney San Diego City Attorney 1200 Third Avenue San Diego, CA 92101 CityAttyCrimProp65@sandiego.gov

1 1

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney San Francisco County 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202 Stockton, CA 95202 DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Eric J.: Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney San Luis Obispo County County Government Center Armex, 4th Floor San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney Santa Barbara County 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101 DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street Santa Cruz, CA 95060 Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org

٠,

On May 24, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a scaled envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on May 24, 2018, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Dunwoody

Phyllis Jums

Service List

District Attorney, Alameda County 1225 Fallon Street, Suite 900 Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street, Suite 202 Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive, Suite 245 Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa County 346 Fifth Street Suite 101 Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Room 171 Crescent City. CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000 Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn County ; Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street 4th Floor Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County 940 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County P.O. Drawer D Independence, CA 93526

District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301 District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles County Hall of Justice 211 West Temple St., Ste 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced County 550 W. Main Street Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202 Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Nevada County 201 Commercial Street Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney. Orange County 401 West Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971 District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San Bernardino County 303 West Third Street San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Suite 1300 San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Shasta County 1355 West Street Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra County 100 Courthouse Square, 2nd Floor Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter County 463 2nd Street Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370 District Attorney, Yuba Counly 215 Firth Street, Suite 152 Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office City Hall East 200 N. Main Street, Suite 800 Los Angeles, CA 90012

San Francisco, City Attorney City Fall, Room 234 I Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL San Francisco, CA 94102

San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Foor San Jose, CA 95113

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as "Proposition 65"). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at:

http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

į,

 $: T_{i_{1}}$

All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html.

The "Proposition 65 List." Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65 list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be "clear and reasonable." This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses "no significant risk." This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific "No Significant Risk Levels" (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at:

http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the "no observable effect level" divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a "significant amount" of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A "significant amount" means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the "no significant risk" level for

7

²See Section 25501(a)(4).

chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the "no observable effect" level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

ij

į.

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure
 occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily
 intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:

http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law/2003.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.